

**REMARKS**

This response is to an Office Action dated 01/26/2006. All rejections and objections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 20-77 are in this case. No new claims are added.

The Office Action rejected claims 20-77 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jappila in view of Primak (US 6,598,077). In response to this rejection, all independent claims in the present application are amended to have the following limitations (wording slightly different to accommodate the specific claims):

***and wherein the first, second and third session group identifiers include one or more data flow sources and one or more data flow destinations***

No new matter is introduced, see original application page 6, lines 8-16.

On page 5 of the Office Action the Examiner states, with respect to claim 41, that Jappila discloses sending data flows to two or more different destinations. Jappila does disclose broadcasting to many receivers. Later on page 5, the Examiner discusses Claim 43 and indicates that the claim language of: “one of more second data flows that are associated with the set of senders with the first data flow...” is suggested in Jappila: section 1; and Primak: column 3, lines 2-5; 15-30; column 8, lines 24-47.

It would be appreciated if the Examiner would consider that section 1 of Jappila refers only to multiple receivers and does not refer to multiple senders.

Also, Primak does not discuss multiple senders participating in a particular session ID. Quoting from column 3, lines 2- 5: “However, if a session already exists between the client and one of the application servers, the dynamic content router routes all requests to such application server.” Note use of the singular “one of the application servers,” and “to such application server.” Quoting from column 8, lines 40-46: “If the request contains a session ID, the dynamic content router 10 compares the session ID against the entries in the session table 12. If the session ID of the request matches a session ID in one of the session records stored in the session table 12, the dynamic content router 10 instructs the plug-in 22b to route the request to the application server associated with the session server ID in the matching session record.” Again note the singular “session server.” Primak does not discuss a session with multiple servers sending multiple receivers. Primak sends the request to the server already assigned to the session ID or, if no match is found, Primak establishes a link to another server.

Jappila does in his section 3 mention “senders, which can use reserved resources in same session.” However, as pointed out by the Examiner, Jappila does not teach assigning session ID’s onto data flows and the sharing of resources if the session ID’s match.

Jappila operates with the receivers being the prime actors in reserving resources along the many paths to the sources. Jappila also discusses the problems in such an approach, and indicates some of these problems are still to be evaluated. There is not a simple solution to the Jappila configuration. Jappila is designed for large multicast groups, and

as mentioned above, in contrast, Primak is not designed for multicasting and does not mention multicasting. Primak discloses the data source (see item 100 in Figure 1), not the receiver, as the actor for assigning resources to accommodate a data flow to some receiver. These two approaches begin in conflict and are not easily reconciled.

For example in a first case, if several receivers, like the client browser 60 in Primak, request resources (as in Jappila) along data paths that are at the same time interacting, common and overlapping, Primak does not suggest any approach to assign bandwidth or other resources to accommodate this scenario. Primak does not acknowledge such a configuration and its inherent problems. Note that Primak never shows more than a single client browser – there are never multiple receivers shown or discussed. Also, in a second case, simultaneously sharing resources along a path from multiple sources to single receiver is not discussed in Primak (as discussed above). Reiterating, the sharing of resources along the interacting, common and overlapping paths from multiple sources to multiple receivers is not a simple issue, and it is not discussed in Primak. Allocating resources in the first case may appear to be sharable in the second case when they are not.

As now amended the session group identifiers include one or more data flow sources and one or more data flow destinations. This limitation distinguishes both Jappila and Primak and combination thereof, and all the claims in the application as presently amended are allowable.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account

No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Edwin H. Paul". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and address.

Edwin H. Paul  
Reg. No. 31,405  
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP  
88 Black Falcon Avenue  
Boston, MA 02210-2414  
(617) 951-2500